



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/342,408	06/28/1999	PING-WEN ONG	12	6490

7590 06/26/2002
RYAN MASON & LEWIS, LLP
1300 POST ROAD, SUITE 205
FAIRFIELD,, CT 06430

EXAMINER

HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/342,408	Applicant(s) ONG, PING-WEN	
	Examiner Thu V Huynh	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06/28/1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2 and 3</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: IDS filed on 06/28/1999 and 10/09/2001 of application filed on 06/28/1999.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. **Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al., US 6,006,227 as supplied by the Applicants in IDS filed on 10/09/2001 in view of Bohannon et al., US 6,125,371 filed 08/1997.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Freeman teaches the steps of:

- receiving a request for an electronic document, said request including a variable time-stamp (Freeman, col.3, lines 15-29, receiving a request including chronological indicator time stamp from a user); and
- identifying said electronic document corresponding to said variable time-stamp (Freeman, col.4 lines 43-46).

Art Unit: 2176

However, Freeman does not explicitly disclose identifying versions of said electronic document corresponding to said variable time-stamp.

Bohannon teaches the implementation of versioning and the use of time stamp to identify the different versions of the document (Bohannon, col.5 lines 36-41)

It would have been obvious for a person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combined Freeman and Bohannon to implement the use of time stamps and versioning to manage a history of documents creation and update since this will provide the capability to identify the different versions of the documents.

Regarding dependent claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein an address identifying said electronic document includes said time-stamp (Freeman, col.3, lines 25-30 and col.13, lines 20-45).

Regarding dependent claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 2 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said address is a Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") (Freeman, col.13, lines 20-45, web address).

Regarding dependent claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said request is specified using a browser (Freeman, col.13, lines 20-35, web address from a web browser).

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said request includes a relative time stamp (Freeman, col.3, lines 19-25, chronological indicators including past, present, and future times).

Regarding dependent claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman does not explicitly disclose wherein said variable time-stamp includes a wildcard character. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the use of wild cards such in a search request since it was well known that wild cards are useful for indicating unknown component in a search.

Regarding dependent claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said variable time-stamp includes a date range (Freeman, col.7 lines 39-59).

Regarding dependent claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches displaying a list of the web resources that satisfy said variable time stamp (Freeman, figure 1 and col.13 lines 10-26).

Regarding dependent claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said variable time-

Art Unit: 2176

stamp can be utilized to identify a version of said electronic document having an unknown time (Freeman, col.3 lines 19-21 and col.4 lines 62-67).

Regarding dependent claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches the step of displaying a list of said documents satisfying said variable time stamp (Freeman, figure 1). However, Freeman does not disclose the step of displaying a list of said versions satisfying said variable time stamp.

Bohannon teaches the step of maintaining a version list of entry between various versions of a document.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bohannon and Freeman to implement the step of displaying a list of said versions satisfying said variable time stamp since this would have provided the user with information concerning the different versions of a document.

Regarding dependent claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches the step of displaying list of documents in an order specified by a user (Freeman, figure 1). However, Freeman does not explicitly disclose the step of displaying said list of links in an order specified by a user.

Bohannon teaches the step of maintaining a version list of entry and links between various versions of a document.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bohannon and Freeman to implement the step of

Art Unit: 2176

displaying said list of links in an order specified by a user since this would have provided the user with information concerning the links between different versions of a document.

Regarding independent claim 13, claim 13 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. Freeman does not explicitly state that the system have a memory for storing said multiple version of said electronic document in an archive of electronic documents; and a processor operatively coupled to said memory, said processor configured to performing method claim 1. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that Freeman and Bohannon' system must have a memory and a processor to implement the method as explained in claim 1, since the system is computer system and used on the web.

Claims 14-15 and 17-24 are for a computer system performing the method of claims 2-3 and 5-12, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 25 is for an article of manufacture comprising computer readable medium performing the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

5. **Claims 4 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman in view of Bohannon as applied to claim 3 above and further in view of Kisor et al., US 5,978,847 filed 12/1996.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 3 as explained above. Freeman does not explicitly disclose wherein said Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") has an associated request header for indicating said variable time stamp.

Kisor discloses that the URL has an associated request header for indicating said time stamp (Kisor, col.3, line 50-59, and col.7, line 21-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Kisor and Freeman to allow the client to retrieve desired Web information based on the time stamp, since Freeman would have provided "a time stamp to determine the Web page's time of last modification" (Kisor, col.3, line 50-54).

Claim 16 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ball et al., US 6366933 B1 teaches method and apparatus for tracking and viewing changes on the web.

Kanfi, US 5559991 teaches incremental computer file backup using check words.

Slivka et al., US 6256668 B1 teaches method for identifying and obtaining computer software from a network computer using a tag.


Art Unit: 2176

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu v Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, except the second Friday of each bi-week.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications, and (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official/Draft.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

TVH
June 24, 2002


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER